REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-21, 28, 30, 33-39, 41-47 and 49-62, as amended, remain herein.

Applicants appreciate the statements in the Office Action that claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-21, 28, 30, 33-36, 40-44, and 49-60 are allowed, although it states that claims 33, 34, 37, 40, 42, 43, 45, 52-54 and 58-60 are objected to, it being understood that they would be allowable if rewritten to amend formalities identified by the Examiner. The Office Action, page 6, includes the statement that claims 28 and 30 are allowed, and that claims 35, 39, 46 and 47, now amended to overcome a rejection under 35 U.S.C. \$1.112, second paragraph, are allowed.

Minor, editorial changes have been made in claims 12, 33-37, 42, 43, 45, 52-54 and 58-60. Claims 2, 22-26 and 40 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

This Amendment places all claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-21, 28, 30, 33-39, 41-47 and 49-62 in condition for allowance, and surely in better condition for any appeal. Thus, entry of this Amendment and allowance of all claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-21, 28, 30, 33-39, 41-47 and 49-62 are respectfully requested.

- 1. Applicants thank the Examiner for providing an initialed copy of PTO Form 1449 indicating receipt and consideration of references accompanying an Information Disclosure Statement filed August 16, 2001. However, the Junji KIDO et al. publication listed at the bottom of Form 1449 under "Other Documents" was not initialed. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide an initialed copy of the form indicating receipt and consideration of the Junji KIDO et al. publication.
- 2. Objections were stated to claims 33, 34, 37, 40, 42, 43, 45, 52-54 and 58-60. Each informality has been amended, thereby mooting those objections.
- 3. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claim 2 has been canceled, thereby mooting the rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

- 4. Claims 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 22 and 23 have been canceled, thereby mooting the rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.
- 5. Claims 37-39 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 37 and 45 have been amended to replace the word "emission" with "charge transport," thereby mooting the rejection. Antecedent bases in claims 37-39 and 45 are now clear. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.
- 6. Claims 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Nagai et al. U.S. Patent 5,702,833. Claims 24-26 have been canceled, thereby mooting the rejection.
- 7. Claims 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Tang et al. U.S. Patent 6,066,357. Claims 22 and 23 have been canceled, thereby mooting the rejection.

All claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-21, 28, 30, 33-39, 41-47 and 49-62 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection stated in the Office Action. Accordingly, allowance of all claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-21, 28, 30, 33-39, 41-47 and 49-62 is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

January 19, 2005

Date

Roger W. Parkhurst

Registration No. 25,177

Robert N. Wieland

Registration No. 40,225

RWP:RNW/mhs

Attorney Docket No.: OGOH:079

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P. 1421 Prince Street, Suite 210 Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805

Telephone: (703) 739-0220

PLEASE ACCEPT THIS AS AUTHORIZATION TO DEBIT OR CREDIT FEES TO DEP. ACCT. 16-0331 PARKHURST & WENDEL